Extra

PHILIP MORRIS U.S.A.

MARKETING RESEARCH DEPARTMENT REPORT

(12)

MRD # : 81024

DATED: August 20, 1981

WRITTEN BY: Jerry Isaacs

SUBJECT: HTI Test of Two MF-5 Models: A Modified Merit Ultra Lights Blend Vs. Marlboro Blend A (Project No. 5153/5154)

OVERVIEW

The low tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF smokers equally preferred the Merit Ultra Lights blend (48%) to Marlboro Blend A (52%). Qualitatively, these smokers were unable to detect any major differences between cigarettes.

The Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm smokers also equally preferred the two products (49%/51%). Qualitatively, these smokers were unable to detect any major differences between the two products.

DISTRIBUTION:

H. Daniel (Rich.)
F. Daylor (Rich.)
T. Goodale
W. McDowell
L. Meyer (Rich.)
J. Morgan
S. Pollack
G. Raed
F. Resnik
R. Seligman (Rich.)
A. Udow
J. Zoler

1002917019

FILE: MERIT ULTRA LIGHTS

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

HTI TEST OF TWO MF-5 MODELS
A MODIFIED MERIT ULTRA LIGHTS BLEND
VERSUS MARLBORO BLEND A

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this test was to determine consumer acceptability of two MF-5 models: A modified Merit Ultra Lights blend versus Marlboro Blend A. Analytically, the two products were the same. This test was conducted via mail placement/telephone callback among low tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF smokers and Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm smokers. Both products were tested blind in plain white coded packages.

FINDINGS

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

1. The low tar 80/85 mm NMF smokers equally preferred the Merit Ultra Lights blend (48%) to Marlboro Blend A (52%). Among the demographic subgroups, none of the margins was statistically significant.

   The average ratings assigned by these smokers to each cigarette on "1" (worst) to "5" (best) scale confirm the overall preference vote in that both products were rated the same -- 3.09 for the Merit Ultra Lights blend and 3.10 for Marlboro Blend A.

   (See Table 1 & 2)

2. When specifically questioned on taste level, ease of draw and harshness, these smokers were unable to isolate any meaningful differences between the two products.

   (See Tables 3, 4 & 5)

3. A review of the remaining qualitative information (Reasons For Preference - Table 6; Dislikes - Table 7) indicates that some preferrers of Marlboro Blend A perceived it as being "mild/not harsh".

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm Smokers

4. The Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm smokers equally preferred the Merit Ultra Lights blend (49%) to Marlboro Blend A (51%). Among the demographic subgroups females significantly (at the 90% level) preferred the Marlboro Blend A while males directionally preferred the Merit Ultra Lights blend.

   The average ratings assigned by these smokers to each cigarette on a "1" (worst) to "5" (best) scale were 3.11 for the Merit Ultra Lights blend and 3.03 for Marlboro Blend A.

   (See Table 1 & 2)

5. When specifically questioned on taste level, ease of draw and harshness, these Marlboro Lights smokers were unable to isolate any meaningful differences between the two products.

   (See Tables 3, 4 & 5)

6. A review of the remaining qualitative information (Reasons For Preference - Table 6; Dislikes - Table 7) indicates that these smokers found little difference between the two products.

1002917020

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

OVERALL PREFERENCE

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

		Average Ratings (1=Worst; 5=Best)
Base: Those who made the test	(233) %	
Prefer Merit Ultra Lights blend	41 (48)	3.09
Prefer Marlboro Blend A	45 (52)	3.10
No Preference	14	

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm Smokers

		Average Ratings (1=Worst; 5=Best)
Base: Those who made the test	(161) %	
Prefer Merit Ultra Lights blend	44 (49)	3.11
Prefer Marlboro Blend A	47 (51)	3.03
No Preference	9	

TABLE 1

1002917021

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

OVERALL PREFERENCE: BY SUBGROUPS

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (233) %	Sex: Male (109) %	Sex: Female (124) %	Age: Under 35 (64) %	Age: 35 & Over (169) %
Prefer Merit Ultra Lights blend	41	41	40	44	40
Prefer Marlboro Blend A	45	40	49	42	46
No Preference	14	18	10	14	14

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (161) %	Sex: Male (78) %	Sex: Female (83) %	Age: Under 35 (130) %	Age: 35 & Over (31) %
Prefer Merit Ultra Lights blend	44	53	36	43	48
Prefer Marlboro Blend A	47	38	54**	45	52
No Preference	9	9	10	12	--

1002917022

** Statistically significant at the 90% level.

TABLE 2

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

TASTE LEVEL

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (233) %	Sex: Male (109) %	Sex: Female (124) %	Age: Under 35 (64) %	Age: 35 & Over (169) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend has more taste	35	30	39	36	34
Marlboro Blend A has more taste	38	43	33	36	38
No Preference	27	26	27	27	27

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (161) %	Sex: Male (78) %	Sex: Female (83) %	Age: Under 35 (130) %	Age: 35 & Over (31) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend has more taste	41	40	42	42	35
Marlboro Blend A has more taste	35	35	36	34	42
No Preference	23	24	22	24	19

TABLE 3

1002917023

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

EASE OF DRAW

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (233) %	Sex: Male (109) %	Sex: Female (124) %	Age: Under 35 (64) %	Age: 35 & Over (169) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend has an easier draw	26	21	30	30	24
Marlboro Blend A has an easier draw	33	35	31	34	32
No Preference	42	44	40	36	44

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (161) %	Sex: Male (78) %	Sex: Female (83) %	Age: Under 35 (130) %	Age: 35 & Over (31) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend has an easier draw	40	44	37	42	32
Marlboro Blend A has an easier draw	38	33	42	34	55
No Preference	22	23	20	24	13

TABLE 4

1002917024

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

HARSHNESS LEVEL

Low Tar (3-15 mg.) 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (233) %	Sex: Male (109) %	Sex: Female (124) %	Age: Under 35 (64) %	Age: 35 & Over (169) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend is harsher	27	21	33	34	26
Marlboro Blend A is harsher	24	28	21	20	26
No Preference	48	50	46	45	49

Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm NMF Smokers

Base: Those in each group	Total (161) %	Sex: Male (78) %	Sex: Female (83) %	Age: Under 35 (130) %	Age: 35 & Over (31) %
Merit Ultra Lights blend is harsher	34	31	36	32	39
Marlboro Blend A is harsher	35	40	30	35	32
No Preference	32	29	34	32	29

TABLE 5

1002917025

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

REASONS FOR PREFERENCE

	Smokers Of:			
	Low Tar 80/85 NMF		Marlboro Lights 80/85 mm	
	Preferred MUL Blend	Preferred Marl. Blend A	Preferred MUL Blend	Preferred Marl. Blend A
Base: Those preferring either cigarette	(95) #	(105) #	(71) #	(75) #
Taste	74	76	47	54
Good taste/tobacco flavor	24	18	14	12
Strong flavor	20	17	12	14
Mild flavor/not harsh	16	22	12	12
Good/no bad aftertaste	13	10	12	11
Smooth taste	6	3	--	3
No bitter taste	4	3	2	1
Ease In Smoking	32	28	28	25
Easy draw/smoke	25	21	21	21
Even drawing	17	11	14	9
Effect On Mouth And Throat	32	38	25	29
Didn't burn mouth/not irritating	30	35	24	21
Mouth didn't feel dry	2	5	1	6
Strength	27	40	30	35
Not harsh	18	19	16	20
Mild/not strong	7	8	5	6
Mild/not harsh	2	11	4	5
Burning Qualities	9	6	9	5
Slower burning	7	4	6	5
Physical Characteristics	4	4	3	7
Filter	4	--	2	--
Coolness	3	2	4	--
Miscellaneous	15	14	15	6
Satisfying	11	9	7	4

TABLE 6

1002917026

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

DISLIKES ABOUT EACH CIGARETTE

	Smokers Of:			
	Low Tar 80/85 NMF		Marlboro Lights 80/85 NMF	
Base:	MUL Blend	Marl. Blend A	MUL Blend	Marl. Blend A
	-233-		-161-	
	#	#	#	#
Taste	71	83	64	58
Flavor too mild/not enough flavor	33	41	32	24
Left bad aftertaste	16	11	14	18
Flavor too strong	10	11	11	10
Poor flavor/disliked taste/ no true tobacco taste	9	12	5	9
Dry taste	7	5	3	2
Strength	44	49	36	43
Too strong (harsh), not mild enough	29	26	18	22
Too mild	15	22	18	20
Burning Qualities	43	59	26	34
Burned too fast	41	57	23	30
Effect On Mouth And Throat	41	37	30	31
Burned throat/irritated mouth and throat	36	32	22	25
Left mouth dry	4	7	9	4
Difficulty In Smoking	38	32	28	20
Not easy drawing/didn't smoke well	31	26	25	20
Filter	31	44	11	22
Dislike long filter	23	34	10	17
Physical Characteristics	9	9	7	13
Coolness	2	6	--	4
Miscellaneous	23	25	13	17
Not satisfying	18	21	13	15

TABLE 7

1002917027

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000

TO: Mr. J. E. Wickham DATE: June 10, 1981

FROM: Elizabeth Chambers

SUBJECT: HTI 5153/5154
Requested by L. Fondren

5153 = M1BN = Red N44 and Black G66 = MF-5 85 mm Model With Modified MUL Blend

5154 = M1BO = Red G66 and Black N44 = MF-5 85 mm Model With Marlboro Blend A

The MF-5 85 mm model (M1BO) with Marlboro blend A was not different from the MF-5 85 mm model (M1BN) with modified MUL blend in any of the characteristics tested.

	MF-5 85 mm Model With Modified MUL Blend	MF-5 85 mm Model With Marlboro Blend A
IBM Code	M1BN	M1BO
HTI#	5153	5154
Smoke		
Butt Length, mm	35	35
FTC Tar, mg/cigt.	4.7	5.0
Nicotine, mg/cigt.	0.37	0.38
Puffs/cigt.	7.5	7.4
Filtration Eff., %	59	59
Cigarette		
Total RTD, in. of H_2O	4.2	4.1
Static Burn. Time, min.	6.0	6.4
Length, mm	84.3	84.2
Circumference, mm	24.9	24.8
Paper		
Additive, type	Cit.	Cit.
Porosity, sec.	9	11
Filter		
RTD, in. of H_2O	4.6	4.5
Length, mm	27.2	27.1
Weight, g	0.19	0.19
Tipping paper length, mm	32	32
Dilution, %	53	52
Filler		
Total alkaloids, %	1.56	1.38
Total reducing sugars, %	3.9	3.0
Wt. of tob., g	0.623	0.608
Rod Density, g/cc	0.221	0.218

Elizabeth Chambers

EC:rrs

cc: Mr. B. A. Soyars
Dr. R. B. Seligman
Mr. W. G. Lloyd
Dr. W. F. Gannon
Mr. L. F. Meyer
Mr. T. T. Goodale
Mr. J. Zoler
Mr. G. F. Raed
Mr. J. S. Osmalov
Mr. F. L. Daylor
Mr. H. G. Daniel
Mr. H. L. Spielberg
Mr. P. N. Gauvin
Mr. W. G. Houck
Mr. S. R. Wagoner
Ms. L. Fondren

1002917028

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/xkkk0000